

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

TAJUAN MARNEZ WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

v.

SHERMAN CAMPBELL,

Respondent,

Case No. 2:15-CV-12914  
HON. NANCY G. EDMUNDS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

**OPINION AND ORDER DENYING THE  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

On February 1, 2016, petitioner's motion to disqualify the Court from adjudicating his habeas petition was denied. Petitioner has now filed a motion for reconsideration. For the reasons stated below, the motion for reconsideration is denied.

U.S. Dist.Ct. Rules, E.D. Mich. 7.1 (h) allows a party to file a motion for reconsideration. However, a motion for reconsideration which presents the same issues already ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication, will not be granted. *Ford Motor Co. v. Greatdomains.com, Inc.*, 177 F. Supp. 2d 628, 632 (E.D. Mich. 2001). A motion for reconsideration should be granted if the movant demonstrates a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled and that a different disposition of the case must result from a correction thereof. *MCI Telecommunications Corp. v. Michigan Bell Telephone Co.*, 79 F. Supp. 2d 768, 797 (E.D. Mich. 1999). A palpable defect is a defect that is obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest, or plain. *Witzke v. Hiller*, 972 F. Supp. 426, 427 (E.D. Mich. 1997).

Petitioner's motion for reconsideration will be denied, because petitioner is merely presenting issues which were already ruled upon by this Court, either expressly or by reasonable implication, when the Court denied the motion to disqualify. See *Hence v. Smith*, 49 F. Supp. 2d 549, 553 (E.D. Mich. 1999).

**ORDER**

Based upon the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration [Dkt. # 12] is **DENIED**.

s/ Nancy G. Edmunds  
**HON. NANCY G. EDMUNDS**  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: February 23, 2016